Quintax®

ANALYTICS REPORT

David Carter

05 November 2015

Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd
Business Psychologists
www.sr-associates.com
© 1998, 2015 Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd. All rights reserved

ABOUT THIS REPORT

This report is intended for use in 'high stakes' assessment situations such as can occur in the selection and progression or career development of managers, leaders, and other senior staff in organisations. This is everywhere, in short, where it is critical to obtain an accurate interpretation of a person's Quintax results, both to ensure a good match between people and their jobs, and because of the costs to the organisation and individual of doing otherwise. The report provides an analysis – in part a 'forensic' analysis – of the style in which the respondent completed Quintax. It is meant to indicate the degree of risk attached to interpreting the respondent's profile at face value. To do this, it considers whether the respondent completed Quintax according to the framework of instructions provided, particularly with regard to the time taken to work through the individual questions and the frequency of changes in response that occurred from question to question. It also gives an indication of the response styles used, such as the degree of agreement and consistency shown, the degree of extremity or central tendency, and the degree of positive self-presentation implied.

The risk assessment provided by the various 'analytics' is based on the traffic light system , in which high, medium, and low risks to interpretation are coded as RED, AMBER, and GREEN respectively. This should help to determine both how to interpret a respondent's profile and how to conduct their Quintax feedback. For example, where the risk factors are high the feedback to the respondent may need to focus more on validating the profile than would otherwise be the case. This may be done by collecting more behavioural evidence in discussion – perhaps through unobtrusive questioning – so as to 'prove' the accuracy of the profile, or by other means.

An initial **Summary Analytics** table is provided showing how the analytics for this respondent compare with those obtained across the Quintax norm group as a whole. A sample of N = 8840 Quintax On-line respondents was used for norming purposes. This is followed by material which explains the analytics presented, and gives the results in more detail. Readers who are new to this report would be well advised to read these more detailed sections first, and then to return to the Summary table subsequently.

Finally some qualifications and tips are given for the report user, and a record is provided of the raw questionnaire responses provided by the respondent.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This computer-generated report is obtained from the results of the Quintax Personality Questionnaire completed by the respondent. As with all self-report personality questionnaires the results rely on the respondent's accuracy, honesty and frankness. The report provides a risk assessment to enable the user to evaluate threats to the validity of the respondent's Quintax profile and other results. It is meant to help users to determine how the respondent has approached completion of the questionnaire, and thus inform how best to conduct feedback. As a result, its specific content will only be of tangential relevance to the main subject of feedback, which should be focussed instead on understanding the individual's general personality preferences and work styles.

Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd accepts no liability of any kind, including negligence, for the consequences of the use of this report and for its contents. This report has been published in an open, pdf format and we cannot guarantee that the contents are unchanged unless it has been downloaded directly from our server.

© 1998, 2015 Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd. Other than for the purpose of using Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd's Quintax On-line assessment service, no part of the present work may be reproduced or copied by any means or through any medium without the express written permission of the publishers. No permission is granted for the editing and/or reuse of any portion of this material. Published exclusively by Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd, Empress Buildings, 380 Chester Road, Manchester M16 9EA, UK. Quintax is a registered trade mark of Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd.

SUMMARY ANALYTICS

Response Choice Analytics	Extent	Risk Factor
Tendency to Agree: Acquiescence	L	Slight risk of undifferentiated disagreement.
Extremity	H	Higher than average use of 'strong' responses.
Central Tendency	L	Somewhat lower than average use of 'slightly' responses.
Consistency	H	Little risk - consistent responses.
Infrequency	NONE	No evidence of random or inattentive responding.
Response Time Analytics	**Extent**	**Risk Factor**
Response Time (over all questions)	VL	Very fast completion compared with norm. Rushed?
Median RT	VL	Very short average time per item compared with norm. Inattentive responding?
Range of RTs (Semi-interquartile)	VL	Shorter range of item response times than norm. Rhythmic responses?
Largest RT (seconds)	AV	Minimal - average for norm.
Smallest RT (seconds)	L	Short 'minimum response time' compared with norm. Expeditious completion?
Response Change Analytics	**Extent**	**Risk Factor**
Number of Questions with Response Changes	AV	Minor evidence suggesting some moderation of 'first response' to questions.
Total Changes of Response (over all questions)	AV	Minor indication of possible changes to 'first response'.
Many changes to small number of questions?	NO	n/a
Small number of changes made to large group of questions?	NO	n/a
Many changes to many items?	NO	n/a
Social Desirabilty Analytics	**Extent**	**Risk Factor**
Social desirability sten score	AV	Self-description appears to be done with realism
Fit with 'Positive Self-Presentation Model', (PSM)	H	Higher than average fit to PSM - elements of profile may be somewhat unrealistic or need corroboration.
Type Differentiation	H	Profile extends into areas away from mean. Type unlikely to need verification.
Overall Risk Analysis	**Sten**	**Interpretation**
Risk Score	7	Amber

Traffic Light Key:

RED = high interpretation risk; AMBER = moderate or medium interpretation risk; GREEN = low interpretation risk.

Key: "VL"= Very Low; "L"= Low; "AV"= Average; "H"= High; "VH"= Very High; "EH"= Extremely High. In most cases above, only the first 5 categories are used. These represent 10%, 20%, 40%, 20%, and 10% of the population respectively. Other categories appear as appropriate based on the distribution of individual measures – for example "EH" is used in Infrequency due to the extended range of this measure. (For the technically minded, the Infrequency distribution is J-Shaped).

"NONE" and "n/a" are used on occasion when no relevant responses occur in a category.

INTRODUCTION

This report provides 'analytics' regarding the approach taken by the respondent when completing Quintax. The report deals with 5 main areas:

RESPONSE AGREEMENT TRENDS

- Agreement or acquiescence statistics – how did the respondent utilise the agreement scale on each question (from strongly disagree to strongly agree); did the respondent tend to agree with many questions?
- Central tendency and extremity – did the respondent utilise the 'slightly agree' and 'slightly disagree' categories heavily; did they gravitate more than the average respondent into the 'strong' agreement and disagreement categories?
- Consistency – were the respondent's answers to questions tapping into the left pole of a scale opposite to (and therefore consistent with) those that related to the right pole? Alternatively, did the respondent tend to show inconsistency by endorsing attributes from both the right and left pole of each scale?
- Infrequency – did the respondent select responses that are typically very rare, and did they do this more than average?

Response agreement trends are important because they can indicate whether the respondent is co-operating with the instructions for the questionnaire, whether they may be adopting a 'defensive profile' e.g. by selecting mid-range responses, whether they have been consistent, or even whether they have been responding without thought and effectively at random.

RESPONSE TIME AND STATISTICS

- How long did the respondent spend in total when answering the questions; was this longer or shorter than average?
- What was the range of times from shortest to longest time taken and what traits did they measure; what was the respondent's median response time and how did this compare to that of others; what was the average time overall, taking out outliers?

Response time is important because a very short response time can indicate a lack of concern with the assessment process. A long response time may indicate that the respondent is completing the questionnaire with extensive reflection, perhaps with tactical objectives in mind related to impression management. Alternatively, they may – if being assessed remotely – be taking an unscheduled break from the questionnaire which might influence their concentration or attention level.

RESPONSE CHANGES

- On how many questions did the respondent change their initial response; how many changes occurred over the whole questionnaire (i.e. across all the questions); what was the maximum number of times a change was made to a response; was there any indication that the changes were focussed on a small number of items or that they were more spread across the whole set of questions?

Response changes are important because they may suggest a failure to 'give a first response' which may compromise the quality of the output profile, or suggest a tactical approach to completion. Alternatively they may indicate a lack of decisiveness, or a lack of clarity in self-description.

SOCIALLY DESIRABLE RESPONSES

- What was the respondent's score on the Quintax Social Desirability scale and did the pattern of their responses on other scales appear to confirm that it was having an impact?
- What advice can be given in dealing with the respondent's SD score?

Social desirability statistics are important because they may suggest a tendency to present a positive profile, rather than one which is more realistic in work place settings. In many cases this is unlikely to be a conscious trend, although the scale can sometimes indicate deliberate, if inexpert, deceit or dissimulation. Matching the data related to social desirability to other trends in the questionnaire can be helpful in determining how much impact it has had on the respondent's profile.

TYPE DIFFERENTIATION

- Do the respondent's scores show enough differentiation to suggest clarity over assignment of their responses to a QuintaxType? Is there similar differentiation in relation to the assignment of a Quintax Temperament grouping?

Type and Temperament Differentiation occur when the respondent's scores on the Quintax scales are sufficiently close to the 'clear preference' designation to enable them to recognise their Type and Temperament characteristics with some clarity as being different from the norm. Scores that fall wholly in the average area or 'middle ground' may be associated with a confusion over which Type is appropriate given the respondent's self-view. An exception to this can occur if a respondent adopts a cautious approach to completion – perhaps opting for central tendency responses – but in feedback recognises and accepts their Type designation with alacrity. However, in other cases a set of scores falling wholly in the middle ground may impact upon the quality and experience of feedback, and therefore the scores in this section help the Quintax User to plan how to handle the feedback process.

OVERALL RISK ASSESSMENT

By utilising information from all the 5 areas above we can estimate how much risk is attached to interpreting the respondent's profile at face value. The report uses the traffic light system to flag areas with little or no risk (GREEN), areas with some unusual features that contribute to risk (AMBER), and those areas where there are clearly departures from the norm that need to be considered carefully before settling on a profile interpretation (RED). Some of the risk can be reduced by conducting a behaviourally focussed feedback interview, so as to balance the evidence of self-report with behavioural questioning and exploration, or by verifying the profile using a request for a further completion of Quintax, or by other means.

WHEN TO USE THIS REPORT

This report is intended to have special value in 'high stakes' situations such as selection or career progression, as it is in these situations that some candidates, quite naturally, feel a pressure to respond tactically or to exercise caution about revealing themselves fully. A high risk score does not imply deceit or deliberate dissimulation, even though the latter may sometimes cause a low score to occur. It is worth bearing in mind that although dissimulation can occur, and can be done expertly in any aspect of assessment or selection, experience tells us that the number of occasions where this does occur is extremely low.

RESPONSE AGREEMENT TRENDS

1. OVERALL AGREEMENT DATA

Overall agreement is about the number of times a respondent uses the 'agree' categories (slightly to strongly) on the questionnaire. It is counted based on the respondent's raw responses, so it includes items that may have been worded for the left pole or the right pole of all six scales. A very high level may represent a tendency to acquiesce generally, irrespective of whether questions are positively or negatively worded for the same trait. It may be that the respondent is not differentiating the questions or has not understood some of the nuances that distinguish them. A very low score may indicate an unwillingness to agree unless a high standard of appropriateness is felt in the question content. Although unusual, a lack of co-operativeness with the assessment process may be involved.

Total 'agreements' on Quintax questions.	Comparison with the Quintax Norm
40	This is low compared with the Quintax Norm Group

2. USE OF AGREEMENT CATEGORIES

The respondent's use of the agreement categories in Quintax is shown below, based on how s/he responded to the 72 questions in the questionnaire. The second row of the table contains the averages across the norm group for comparison. It is in this table that grossly aberrant data, e.g. giving the same response to every question, will be seen if it has occurred.

Responses	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Actual	5	18	9	8	20	12
Average for Norm Group	4.5	12.9	10.8	15.8	20.5	7.6

The table below shows the extent to which the respondent utilised the 'Strong' vs 'Slight' agreement categories. Use of 'Strong' to the exclusion of all other categories suggests an 'extremity' bias or a desire to paint a picture of self in very bold colours. Use of 'Slightly' to the exclusion of other categories suggests a 'central tendency' bias or a desire to give only partial agreement (or disagreement) with the Quintax questions. This type of bias may stem from a nervousness about describing oneself in definitive terms, or from a lack of confident knowledge about how a person does react in work situations, or from a perception that limiting oneself to slight agreement categories may provide a 'safe option' in high stakes situations.

Indices of Extremity and Central Tendency	Score	Comparison with Quintax Norm
Frequency of use of 'Strong' agreement categories	17	This is high compared with the Quintax Norm Group.
Frequency of use of 'Slight' agreement categories	17	This is low compared with the Quintax Norm Group

It is important to be clear that using either 'Strong' or 'Slight' categories of agreement is not in itself distortive, as the norm for the population shows that many of us need to use these categories to make our self-description appear accurate. It is the overuse of these categories that can create a problem for the interpreter in producing profiles that are either 'muddied' in the middle ground (which may be due to Central Tendency) of characterised by clear preferences on every trait (which may be due to Extremity). Because the latter profiles are very clear in their interpretation, and because of other considerations Extremity tends to create less of a problem for the interpreter than Central Tendency. However, interpretation is generally always more straightforward if the respondent has obtained his/her profile scores – whatever they are – without being subject to either Extremity or Central Tendency response styles.

Finally, it is also possible statistically for a profile to exhibit ***both*** Extremity ***and*** Central Tendency. This could happen for example if a respondent failed to use either the 'Agree' or 'Disagree' categories, but thankfully these cases are very rare. Rather than illustrating genuine Extremity or Central Tendency such individuals are probably illustrating a desire to simplify the rating process so as to expedite completion, or some more idiosyncratic approach to the scales.

3. CONSISTENCY AND INFREQUENCY

The **consistency** of a respondent's scores is assessed by checking how far their responses to questions tapping the left pole of a trait agree with their responses to the questions tapping the right pole. Any tendency for a person to agree with, for example, items which describe them as introvert whilst also agreeing with those that describe them as extravert (and vice versa) will count towards reducing their score on consistency. The score is aggregated over the five main trait scales in Quintax and compared with the Quintax Norm Group.

Infrequency is a measure of the extent to which a respondent chooses responses to questions which are rather rare – in some cases representing no more than 1% of responses found typically in the norm group. Selecting such responses on a regular basis throughout the questionnaire may suggest a lack of concentration or focus, a lack of co-operation, a motivational issue, or even deliberate random responding. As a result a high score is worthy of exploration with the respondent. It is also worth noting that this scale can pick up a number of types of unusual response styles. For example if a respondent answers questions simply by cycling repetitively through the number keys on a 1-2-3-4-5-6 basis, enough rare responses will be given so as to trigger Infrequency. Similarly giving certain responses (e.g. 'Strongly Agree') repeatedly and exclusively throughout the questionnaire will cause enough rare responses to be given to trigger Infrequency.

These types of behaviour are very unusual, because they involve subverting the response process and the purpose of the questionnaire almost completely and there are few circumstances in which this might be a sensible course of action for a respondent. If the act of compliance with the completion of a questionnaire is important – e.g. to maintain a good relationship with the administrator – but the outcome has no significance for the respondent, then this type of aberrant responding might occasionally occur. However, even here good test administration should help to motivate even the most disinterested and disaffected respondents.

Indices of Consistency and Infrequency	Score	Comparison with Quintax Norm
Consistency	132	This is high compared with the Quintax Norm Group.
Infrequency	0	There are no infrequency responses for this respondent.

Finally, because Infrequency is based upon rare responses, and because these typically arise in the 'Strongly agree' or 'Strongly disagree' categories, there is a small correlation between Extremity and Infrequency. It is therefore sensible to interpret Infrequency with caution if the respondent also has a high Extremity score.

RESPONSE TIME AND STATISTICS

Response time for completion of a question can reveal factors such as the extent of reflection done by the respondent; is the respondent taking a great length of time, or indeed are they rushing through the questionnaire? In either case the interpreter may have cause to wonder about the quality of the responses being given. The time taken by the respondent to reach a first response on each question is recorded and these are shown in the first table below across all 72 questions in Quintax. The time taken to give a first response (summed across all questions) is shown in the second table below.

< 1 sec	< 3 secs but >= 1 sec	< 5 secs but >= 3 sec	< 15 secs but >= 5 sec	< 30 secs but >= 15 sec	< 60 secs but >= 30 sec	< 5 mins but >= 1 min	>= 5 min
42	26	2	1	0	1	0	0

Time to first response summed across all questions (mins)	Comparison with the Quintax Norm
1.98	This is very low compared with the Quintax Norm Group.

The median, quartile, and semi-interquartile range statistics for this respondent's response times across the questionnaire are shown below. Norm comparisons are given for the two key values. The 'Median RT' is the 'middlemost' response time for this respondent; 50% of the respondent's scores fall between Q1 and Q3, and SIQR is the average difference between the quartiles and the respondent's Median response time. The average of all the respondent's response times – trimmed of extreme values or outliers – is also shown below.

RT Statistics	RTs in seconds	Comparison with Quintax Norm
Median RT	0.73	This is very low compared with the Quintax Norm Group.
SIQR	0.79	This is very low compared with the Quintax Norm Group.
Quartile 1	0.41	*Norms not applied*
Quartile 3	1.99	*Norms not applied*
Trimmed Mean	1.14	*Norms not applied*

The trimmed mean reflects the average when an extended break from the questionnaire (or for that matter a question completed in an eye-blink!) is ignored. A value that is similar to the median for the respondent is an encouraging indication that the measures taken of response time are reflective of the respondent's actual process and distribution of attention when completing Quintax. Statistically, it suggests that the bulk of the response times are evenly spread around the median, rather than being skewed high or low.

Finally, a sense of the range involved is given by examining the items that take the respondent the greatest and the least amount of time to complete. While it may make sense to ask a question during feedback to discuss the respondent's reactions to the two scales involved, it would be unwise to attach too much significance to the specific questions listed below.

Largest and Smallest Response times	Question Number	Quintax Scale	RTs in secs	Norm (re other largest and smallest RTs)	Question Content
Largest	7	Intellectual Focus	33.40	AV	I can usually see how things could be improved.
Smallest	72	Organisation	0.17	L	I can't always find things that I have put away.

RESPONSE CHANGES

Statistics on response change can tell us the degree of decisiveness or indecisiveness implied in a respondent's completion of the questionnaire. It is also possible that error factors – rhythmic or nervous mouse clicking for example – may play a part. The data for this respondent are shown below. A small or zero number of changes is most consistent with the hypothesis of a respondent working through the questions giving a frank and immediate reaction to each question.

Response Change	Number or Presence	Comment
Number of questions with changes	4	This is average or similar to others in the Quintax Norm Group
Total changes of response	4	This is average or similar to others in the Quintax Norm Group
Maximum number of changes on any one question	1	*Norms not applied*
Question with largest number of response changes	n/a	> than 1 item with the maximum number of response changes
Many changes made to a small number of questions?	NO	n/a
Small number of changes made to a large group of questions?	NO	n/a
Many changes to many items?	NO	n/a

The first of the final three elements in the table was determined by checking if the respondent combined a high maximum number of changes to one item with a relatively small total number of questions changed. A 'YES' here would indicate that a small number of questions caused the respondent to vacillate a good deal. If there is a specific question with more response changes than others it will be tabled for inspection. It may be that the respondent has been unable to make up his/her mind in relation to the question presented – it may be unwise to make any grand assumptions about what is going on, but the issues raised in the question (rather than the answer that the respondent gave) may be worth pursuing in feedback.

The second entry is triggered if a small number of changes are made in each case to a large total number of questions changed. A 'YES' here indicates a tendency to make one or two changes to answers across a large range of questions. As mentioned earlier, this may reflect a rather indecisive response style, a tendency to rethink immediate responses tactically, or a more idiosyncratic error factor.

The final entry is triggered if a large maximum number of changes in a given item occur along with changes of response to a large total number of items. In these cases a 'YES' may indicate that the respondent is considering his/her responses carefully in individual cases and is substantially moderating his/her first response before moving on to the next part of the questionnaire. It may represent a tactical approach to questionnaire completion, or a more idiosyncratic error factor.

In cases where a NO-NO-NO occurs, it may be that a relatively small number of changes have been made to a relatively small number of items. This would be unlikely to imply a systematic error trend, and as it would imply low numbers of changes overall it would support the hypothesis of compliance with the request for an immediate response.

SOCIALLY DESIRABLE RESPONSES

In Quintax, a twelve item Social Desirability ('SD') scale measures the extent to which, when given the choice, respondents tend to reply to questions by choosing responses that imply a positive self-evaluation. In individual cases this may or may not be a conscious trend. Although it is generally not seen as a significant personality trait, research has indicated that it is 'trait-like' in that persons who respond in a socially desirable manner tend to do so on a variety of questionnaire measures of SD. It may be linked to one's general sense of self-worth or self-esteem, and equally, one reason for obtaining low scores may be a generally low sense of self-worth or self-esteem. However, SD is thought of as a potential obstacle in measuring personality traits accurately via self-report, as some of the traits measured in personality questionnaires appear to imply negative self-evaluation. SD tends to be positively correlated with Organisation (high SD being correlated with higher self-ratings for Structure) and Emotional Involvement (higher SD being correlated with higher self-ratings for Calm). In a high stakes setting particularly, one may be concerned as to whether high SD will cause elevation in both of these self-rated areas. As a result this report covers two facets:

- The respondent's Socially Desirability score on the twelve item scale (expressed as a sten), and
- The degree of fit to a 'Positive Self-Presentation Model' or 'PSM'.

The PSM is a combination of high SD, high Structure, and high Calm. Scores in all three areas have been pooled for the respondent and compared with those obtained by the Quintax Norm Group. The score in this area tells us whether the respondent is manifesting the signs of 'Positive Self-Presentation' and it therefore indicates whether there is a risk to interpreting the respondent's profile at face value. Without high scores for Structure or Calm, a high SD score may simply indicate an elevated sense of self-worth, without this impacting upon the accuracy of Quintax scores, but if all three aspects rise together then its suggests a risk to straightforward interpretation. Some personality researchers (see Cattell et al (1970), Goffin & Christiansen (2003), Krug & Cattell (1971), and particularly Krug (1978)) have argued in favour of correcting scores on some personality scales (related to conscientiousness and emotional stability) for the elevation caused by a high 'Faking Good' score, a concept related to social desirability. The corrections recommended by Krug (1978) for the 16PF are in the order of 1 to 2 stens to relevant scales. In our view making the assumption of serious distortion in the five Quintax trait scores based upon a high Social Desirability score in the absence of a high score for PSM would be hazardous. Scores on Quintax factors are not automatically corrected for the socially desirable response style.

In practical terms our advice is to look at both of the indices shown below. If both are high, then some form of behavioural interviewing at feedback time may be of value in 'proving' the respondent's scores for (particularly) Structure and Calm. If the SD sten is less than 8, then a straightforward interpretation of the respondent's profile is in order. It is unlikely that SD will be low with PSM high, but in these cases the risk factor attached to either score should be discounted.

Socially Desirable Responses		
Measure	Score	Comments
SD Sten	5	AV
Fit with Positive Self-Presentation Model	169	H

TYPE DIFFERENTIATION

We can compute statistics to help indicate the degree of 'clarity' in a person's profile, type, and temperament measurements. These are indicated in the table that follows.

Type Fit Characteristics	Details
Actual Type	ELST-C
Type taking into account Preference Strength	eLst-C
Actual Temperament	Logical Strategist or LT
Type Differentiation Score	9.5 (max of 22.5)
..compared with Quintax Norm	High

The table above tells us the respondent's Quintax Type and Temperament, and the degree of differentiation attached to the Type concept. This is essentially the degree to which there is clarity – indicated by the respondent's scores, in the assignment of Type and Temperament. The closer a respondent is to the average areas of each Quintax scale, the less Type and Temperament clarity can be expected. Thus in feedback it may be that the respondent will feel some affinity with a range of Types and Temperaments apart from those assigned, purely due to their closeness to the 'average' for the norm.

In the Temperament Fit table an indication is given of how closely the respondent's profile matches to the classic temperament descriptions. The 'Actual Temperament' shown above is the closest fit given the scores obtained by the respondent, but if his/her scores fall in the middle range it may be that other temperaments also have a degree of fit. For example, an SG with an S sten score of 6 will also score high for AG, as they are only one sten away from this temperament – a difference within measurement error. If the degree of fit for the Actual Temperament is much higher than the others in the following table then the respondent's profile will represent a clear and relatively pure illustration of the temperament's facets.

Again, these aspects have been included in the report to give the user a preliminary view of the issues that may be raised in reaching a straightforward interpretation of the respondent's Quintax profile, and in feeding it back.

Temperament Fit	Type Preferences	Degree of Fit Compared with Quintax Norm
Troubleshooter	AG	Very low
Organiser and Do-er	SG	Average
Logical Strategist	LT	Very High
Passionate Idealist	PT	Low

IMPLICATIONS OF THE OVERALL RISK SCORE

Overall Risk = AMBER. The risk factors shown in the respondent's profile suggest a moderate level of concern about the way the questionnaire was completed. It is likely that the respondent did not complete the questionnaire entirely in the expected manner. This may be due to giving little consideration to some questions, or by vacillating in response in some cases, or by spending a lot of time on other questions. Inspection of the summary table of Analytics may indicate a specific area or issue which has caused the risk factors to result in an AMBER code. If the questionnaire was completed remotely without an administrator present, it may be worth asking the respondent for details of the process to see if an unusual circumstance (e.g. a break made necessary in completing the questionnaire) has caused this result to occur. In addition it may be worth including a behaviourally oriented questioning style in feedback and to apply this carefully when dealing with Organisation and Emotional Involvement if the SD indicators have indicated high scores.

SOME GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS AND TIPS WHEN USING THIS REPORT

- This report is intended to indicate risks that may be associated with completing Quintax in a manner which is different from that implied in our standardised instructions. As such it is meant to indicate if and when a candidate's approach to the questionnaire may produce results that are difficult to interpret at face value. As much as anything, it is meant to give the User an indication as to how to approach feedback – either using exploratory questions and probes, or a more straightforward validation style.

- The report may be most useful in high stakes situations such as selection but it should be borne in mind that access to certain types of corporate development path (e.g. starting a programme of grooming for the role of a Senior Manager) are also high stakes settings where the report may add value. It may be of less value in areas such as career or personal counselling where there is an incentive to approach questionnaire completion in a conscientious, open, and honest manner.

- Because of the considerations above, our best advice is to use, wherever possible, directly supervised modes of administration. Not only can the respondent be observed in completing the questionnaire, but it is also possible to provide a clear and persuasive motivational framework for the respondent to present themselves in an open manner, and to do this in a direct and personal way. Respondents completing questionnaires online – between work assignments or at unusual times of day – may not always be mentally prepared for the process, and may not gain as much from written instructions in an email than from personal contact. Much as it is inconvenient, respondents completing a questionnaire on a train via a mobile phone may not always be following the instructions as closely as when supervised face-to-face. Many psychologists still hold the view expressed by Cattell that good test administration is the best way to obtain an accurate profile, for example by mitigating the effects of motivational distortion or 'faking good'.

- Where a respondent receives an overall interpretation code of RED, the user should treat the feedback process as one of evidence gathering, by discussion of the respondent's real experiences at work. It is not generally sufficient in these circumstances merely to seek agreement with the output profile scores. This is particularly the case if the factors generating a RED indication depend upon high scores in Social Desirability indicators. The report may signal sensitive areas – e.g. based upon lengthy periods of time spent on a particular item. In these cases a general question on the topic will probably prove more valuable than a specific attempt to revisit the question content.

- Treat the respondent as an ally, and certainly never as a 'suspect' when trying to determine the meaningfulness of the scores – they may have spent considerable time on questions that they have not previously considered. Not all respondents have a considered view of themselves which has been developed after extended reflection!

- Never treat a GREEN overall interpretation code as a complete validation of the profile. Examination of the summary table of analytics may indicate areas where the respondent has shown unusual behaviour compared with the norm, and this should be evaluated in interpreting their scores.

- There may be occasions when you feel it may be helpful for a respondent to repeat the assessment, if for example the analytics show many RED or AMBER codes. The decision needs to take into account the issue of whether any practical advantage can be gained – is the respondent likely to co-operate, and will the second testing merely provide a temptation or an avenue for a more sophisticated attempt at impression management? Stressing the instructions (regarding open, honest responding at a pace) through good administration in the first assessment is more likely to provide interpretable results than the option of reassessment. Discussing the first assessment in advance, rather than simply relying upon an email invitation to communicate the message, is also more likely to achieve the desired goal.

- If you do need to ask a respondent to repeat the assessment, it is almost always best to do this under supervised administrator conditions. It is also better to develop a collaborative agreement that this is necessary, rather than by attempting to compromise the initial assessment. It is perfectly possible that a candidate for selection has attempted the questionnaire in unusual or non-optimal circumstances because of pressures of time and responsibility – we all have current work and often family obligations to meet. In these cases it is preferable to recognise that the first assessment may not have produced a clear output because it was done under unsatisfactory conditions, and that the respondent deserves the opportunity to focus more fully and without distraction on the assessment process.

- It may be appropriate in some circumstances of re-testing to ask a candidate to focus more upon the clearer response categories (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) to try to achieve clarity in self-description rather than allow their responses to drift into the 'Slightly Agree' or Slightly Disagree' categories. This is particularly true in cases where Central Tendency on the initial assessment is high.

- In feeding back a Quintax profile where Central Tendency is high, it may often be fruitful to guide the respondent through the individual factor pole descriptions given in the Quintax Interpretation Guide. They can then be asked to identify which terms they would use for self-description and which they would not use. This is often useful in helping a respondent recognise the degree of their preference for a particular factor pole, via recognition of individual behaviours rather than by identifying which overall descriptor of a factor (left or right pole) 'sounds' more appropriate.

- In cases where Consistency is low, it may be worth exploring in each factor whether there are clear areas in which the respondent may behave in one way in some circumstances but in other ways in other circumstances. Particular instances of this (e.g. of a manager being more Structured at work than in other settings) are not improbable, and deserve some investigation or discussion in order to validate the respondent's scores.

- Where a respondent appears to be genuinely balanced centrally on a factor, and thus tends to demonstrate behaviours from both the left and right pole, it may not be wise to try to persuade or worse cajole a respondent to show more affinity to one pole rather than the other. Equally one should be careful in describing the individual to others in terms of either left or right pole – this may provoke a reaction ("she would never be seen by colleagues as an introvert!") given a balanced sten score near the average. This would be particularly true if the respondent's Type Differentiation is low, but they also have an average score on Central Tendency. In these cases it may be that the respondent is endorsing different behaviours in Quintax (both from the left and right pole of a factor) because they are genuinely balanced in their behavioural styles. Examining the Consistency score may be helpful in these cases.

- Some users may wish to develop hypotheses about the respondent's styles and preferences for testing during feedback, based on their individual responses to the Quintax questions. These are provided (with some caveats as to their use) in the Appendix to this report. These may also be helpful if, for instance, a respondent shows inconsistency in their questionnaire responses. The text of the questions in Quintax may be found in the Quintax User Guide (Robertson & Wilkie, 2015).

- A further use of the response listing is to allow users to spot any obvious response patterns that might suggest an atypical approach to completion, for example inattentiveness, rhythmic responding, or a plain failure to co-operate. Long strings of repeated responses, for example, can be seen very easily when they occur in the response table. In the Quintax 2015 norm group, fewer than 1% of respondents have a maximum repeated response string (the largest number of times on which they repeat a response exactly over a consecutive series of questions) of more than 7. It follows that a respondent who does this is doing something highly unusual, and that this may be worthy of investigation – e.g. in terms of the content of the questions, or via discussion – as it may compromise the interpretability of their profile.

REFERENCES

CATTELL, R.B., EBER, H.W., TATSUOKA, M.M. (1970)

Handbook for the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Il.: IPAT.

GOFFIN, R.D. & CHRISTIANSEN, N.D. (2003)

Correcting personality tests for faking: a review of popular personality tests and an initial survey of researchers. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment.*, **11**, 4, 340 – 344.

KRUG, S.E. (1978)

Further evidence on 16PF Distortion Scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment.*, **42**, 5, 515 – 518.

KRUG, S.E. & CATTELL, R.B. (1971)

A test of the trait-view theory of distortion in measurement of personality by questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement.*, **31**, 721 – 734.

ROBERTSON, S.A. & WILKIE D.T. (2015).

Quintax User Guide. 2nd Ed. Manchester: Stuart Robertson & Associates Ltd.

APPENDIX

Expert users may occasionally wish to review responses to individual questions, either to deepen their understanding of the respondent's profile or as a basis of some discussion or feedback approach. For this reason the respondent's original responses are shown below. It is important, however, to bear in mind that responses to individual questions lack the reliability of total scale scores. As a result, the total score respondents obtain on a scale is more likely to be stable and consistent than the specific answers they give to individual questions. Consequently, one should not place too much store by individual responses and respondents should certainly never be asked to justify them in a feedback or interview situation. They can be used however to help form hypotheses and frame questions about a respondent's general behaviour in the work place, or to look for further confirmation of their approach.

Responses to Quintax Questions										
Item	..1	..2	..3	..4	..5	..6	..7	..8	..9	..0
1 - 10	d	SA	SA	A	D	A	A	D	D	d
11 - 20	D	D	SA	A	D	A	A	a	A	d
21 - 30	d	A	a	A	SA	D	D	D	SA	D
31 - 40	D	a	SA	A	a	A	A	D	a	SD
41 - 50	A	SA	SA	SA	SD	A	d	A	D	A
51 - 60	SA	A	D	a	D	A	SD	d	D	d
61 - 70	SA	a	d	A	d	A	D	SD	a	SA
71 - 72	D	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Response Key					
SD	D	d	a	A	SA
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree